

REMARKS

Claim Disposition

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10 and 13-19 have been rejected. Claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 12 are objected to. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 12 and 17 have been amended.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 1, 2, 8 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Maeda U.S. Patent No. 5,802,841 hereinafter referred to as Maeda. Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully submit that Maeda does not disclose all of the elements of the claims. To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Bariant, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Independent Claims 1 and 17 (as well as dependent Claims 6, 7, 11 and 12) have been amended to include a limitation that the lateral space between angled strips is an “*empty*” space. Figures 2-8, of the originally filed application, clearly shows *empty* lateral spaces 42 and 44 as are described in detail in paragraph [0023] of the specification. The lateral space between angled strips in Maeda, as correctly identified by the Examiner, is not an empty space but is, in fact, space filled with element 27a as shown in Figures 9 and 10. Maeda, therefore, does not teach, disclose or even suggest this limitation of the instant application. As such, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 17.

Dependent Claims 2, 8, 13-16 and 18-19 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon the independent Claims 1 and 17 and are, therefore, also allowable for at least this reason.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Maeda.

Claim 10, being dependent upon Claim 1, includes the limitation of the lateral *empty* space between angled strips that is not disclosed in Maeda as described above. The argument, therefore, which the Examiner puts forth in rejecting Claim 10, that “to the extent that the claimed invention produces the claimed desired results, the prior art structure being the same, does the same,” is not applicable since the prior art structure is not the same. As such, a rejection for obviousness is improper and should be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s identification of allowable subject matter in Claims 3-7, 9, 11 and 12. Applicants wish to defer the acceptance of such allowable subject matter to a later time.

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicants. In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted response, the undersigned respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By 

Daniel A. Gilmour

Registration No. 59,059

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

Date: September 12, 2007